R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 019 930 JC 680 173

JUNIOR COLLEGE ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE (ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY, DECEMBER 6-7, 1967).

BY- NEWBURN, H.K. AND OTHERS

PUB DATE 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.28 30P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *CONFERENCE REPORTS, GOVERNANCE, *COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION, *TEACHER ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIP, ADMINISTRATOR ROLE, TEACHER ROLE, GOVERNING BOARDS, *BOARD ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIP, POLICY FORMATION,

A MAJOR PAPER AT THE CONFERENCE CONCERNED THE ROLE OF THE FACULTY IN JUNIOR COLLEGE GOVERNANCE, EMPHASIZING THAT EFFECTIVE FACULTY PARTICIPATION REQUIRES (1) ADEQUATE REPRESENTATION OF THE FACULTY, (2) EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION BETWEEN FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION, AND (3) FACULTY AUTHORITY IN THOSE AREAS LEGITIMATELY WITHIN ITS POWER. A SECOND SPEAKER DISCUSSED THE FOLLOWING TOPICS CONCERNING ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL--(1) THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE BOARD AND PRESIDENT, (2) THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE BOARD AND OTHER ADMINISTRATORS, (3) THE OVERALL ROLE OF ADMINISTRATORS, (4) THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE PRESIDENT AND THE PUBLIC, AND (5) THE ROLE OF LEGAL ADVISORY SERVICES. REPORTS OF THREE DISCUSSION GROUPS ARE INCLUDED, AS IS A CONFERENCE SUMMARY REPORT. (WO)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED019930

Junior College Administrative Conference

THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

John T. Condon

Dean A. Curtis

George L. Hall

Thomas H. Metos

Don Pence

H. K. Newburn
Director of the Conference

JC 680 173

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

APR 15 1968

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

Dec. 6-7, 1967

[Arizona State University,
Tempe, Arizona]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	The Role of the Faculty in the Governance of the Junior-Community College by Dr. Karl Jacobs, Vice-President, Flint Community College	1
II.	Reports of the Three Group Sessions Wednesday Evening, December 6, 1967	11
III.	Summary Report by Dr. John T. Condon, Executive Director, Arizona State Junior College Board	14
IV.	Suggested Questions for Discussion Groups	17

THE ROLE OF THE FACULTY IN THE GOVERNANCE OF THE JUNIOR-COMMUNITY COLLEGE

While a faculty member for a number of years I was completely in agreement with the late Ambrose Bierce's definition of administration as "an ingenious abstraction....designed to absorb kicks and cuffs, proof against bad eggs and dead cats."

As an administrator in a large complex urban community college I am still convinced that administration is "an ingenious abstraction," but equally discerning is the realization that the faculty, like the administration, is also "an ingenious abstraction."

I understand that my task today is to essentially represent the faculty point of view, or to state it another way, I invite you to a modest session of REVERSE "bad egging" and "dead catting."

Before attempting any discussion of administration-faculty relationships it is necessary that we first try to answer the question, "What is the faculty?" A few critics, and there are remarkably few, have termed the community college faculty as gratefully upgraded high school teachers and academic drop-outs from the graduate school who are ministering to the needs of academically handicapped students in what is basically an anti-humanistic half-way house of learning. Such an uncritical interpretation does not warrant our attention today, but it does point up the fact that as there is confusion over what is the faculty among the professionals, there is more dangerous confusion among some as to what the community college itself is. This confusion is understandable to a point. No other aspect of higher education has developed so rapidly and I would further say that no other part of higher education has had so many demands placed upon it from so many diverse groups in our society. It is not surprising, therefore, that instant campuses, instant administration and faculty has created tensions and unrest among a number of faculties. Such unrest I believe will exist for some time until traditions and patterns develop.

The genesis of any discussion of what is the faculty must start with the rhetorical question, "What is it that <u>you</u> expect of community college teaching?" Or, more important, "What do you expect to <u>get</u> from community college teaching?"

Do you expect your teaching staff to be <u>functionary</u>, <u>faculty</u> or <u>facility</u>? This question could be asked of any level of education, but I believe it has a particular pertinency to the community college.

If you view your teaching staff to be solely a teaching staff, then you wish it to serve a function; then it is as a natural consequence, a functionary. Such a purpose is worthy of serious consideration, but in turn requires further exploration to determine whether such a hypotheses stands the rigor of analysis. As administrators you expect the faculty in the academic areas to maintain the same qualitative standards in courses taught that one would expect in the four-year college or university. In the career programs you expect the faculty to not only teach courses, but to develop the programs, recruit the students, and in a few instances, to convince the employer of the virtues of the program and its graduates. (In some cases the graduates of these programs soon match the salaries of the faculty.)

You further expect the faculty to accomplish this task within the philosophy, or more accurately, within the mystique of the "open-door" policy. You <u>hope</u> the

faculty will accomplish this purpose without an attrition rate so prohibitive that it will offend the political and financial sensibilities of the all-too-proximate local citizenry upon which you substantially depend for financial support. In short, you expect paradox out of dilemma!

What is expected of the faculty, which demands a considerable amount of individual attention and availability, in a situation where the faculty may carry a teaching load 50 to 300% greater than in an established college or university? True, that in most cases scholarly research and publication is not demanded which is the argument put forth for lower teaching loads; the faculty is expected to dedicate this forfeited time to research into individual student problems, and it is no less time consuming than scholarly research, and I would hope no less elevated.

A few years ago the Director of the A.A.J.C. described the community college as a "new social invention" and argued that:

> "The community college has its most productive development not when it is conceived of as the first two years of the baccalaureate degree program, nor when seen as grades thirteen and fourteen, but as an institution in its own right--a new kind of college standing between the high school and university--offering broad programs of experiences of value in and of themselves, neither post-high school as such or pre-college as such."

I don't quarrel with such a definition--in fact it's theoretical premise describing the nature and comprehensiveness of the community college is accurate and clear. However, I do contend that involved in such a definition is, indeed, the paradox I described earlier--what is expected out of community college teaching, and if it is not part of the K-12 or the first two years of the university, then where or what is it that the faculty looks to as a model of behavior?

In the classroom you do expect, I presume, the rigorous pursuit of truth; the communication of the importance and the means of discipline of thoughts; the avenues and formalities of educated expression; the questioning attitude; and, indeed, all the other hallmarks of the educated man. These are all logical ends of the educational process, but I submit they cannot be legitimately conferred or confined within the four walls of the classroom.

The teacher must bring to the class, collectively and individually, a commitment and this commitment will be neither developed nor nourished unless it is exercised outside the classroom. The student to benefit must take something from the classroom to apply. In both the case of the student and the teacher the immediate field of exercise is the institution at large.

For the teacher to carry such a commitment he must have an identity that transcends the definition of a functionary. It is at this point of identity that we again come full circle. When it is said that the community college is neither the first two years of the traditional college and university, and not grades thirteen and fourteen of an extended secondary school, then where are you asking in a precise way for the faculty member to take his stand? Is he expected to relate to the mores of the traditional high school--student centered, weighted to the teaching function, and generally with a rigid administration-faculty organizational pattern; or is he to find solace with colleagues in the college and

university? What complicates the problem of identity further for the community college teacher is the low opinion of teachers and the "teaching function" held by many in our country. We are all aware that mobility and prestige in American education increases for the individual the further they are from the classroom. For many community college faculty there is an all too grim awareness that they are at the bottom of the academic ladder or the academic pecking order. For some faculty they may see themselves arrogantly at the top of a pseudo-secondary system.

I only raise the question of faculty identity because it is pertinent to an understanding of faculty relationships. If one is to accept generally the commitments of the teacher in the classroom then you may admit, perhaps, that the teacher must be something more than a functionary in order to fulfill this function.

I think it is appropriate to explore the second possibility of what is the faculty, which I would remind you is that of a facility. With my discussion of the faculty as a function of the institution you may already anticipate my next tact.

Have you, therefore, created channels through which the inquiring mind of the faculty may be directed and intelligent questions asked? Is there a "faculty structure" of organs and committees built upon a certain formality of faculty meetings? And does this structure touch at least tangentially upon the operation of the administrative offices? The particular structure or form such a government may take is less important to me, at this time, than the question of function and purpose.

Does it provide for meaningful and fruitful expression of the mind of the faculty (assuming there is such a thing) in an effective manner; or is the structure of such a nature that faculty expressions get tangled in a bureaucratic labyrinth, or at least buried until the time for effective action has passed? Is it a controllable system with outcomes either obvious or predictable? If any of the above pertain, then it may be assumed that the structure is a facade, and that the purpose may really be only to allow for such outlets of faculty expression that relieve tensions and facilitate the teaching function described earlier. If this be true, the teaching staff and its "representative system" have become a facility, the second of the two categories.

Functionary, facility, or faculty--the most significant of the three is the faculty. A faculty, by classical definition, must share in the governance of an institution. A corollary to this thesis is that effective teaching demands the meaningful involvement of the faculty in the control of the institution and, therefore, the existence of a faculty.

There are scholarly studies and classic examples to prove the relationship between the strength of the faculty and the effectiveness and quality of the institution. The exact relationship between the two--faculty and quality--is not always clear, but if one is to assume some cause and effect relationship, the implications are immense.

The community college is yet untested. On the whole, as I mentioned earlier, its critics are relatively few and its supporters many. But if this kind of an institution is to continue to grow and to realize the fruits of its purposes the requirement of a strong, effective faculty is essential.

The quality of the community college faculty will never reach its optimum if

it is derived from either the disappointed, the frustrated or even the more ambitious among existing teachers in kindergarten through high school, or conversely from the chaff of the threshing machine that is the academic market place for higher education of which much has been written.

A consideration of the role of faculty must inevitably, at least, be considered from a vested point of view that most of us here share--the administrator's point of view.

If we are to survive, and I presume that is in part our intention--I am reminded of the often repeated story of the French aristocrat who was asked what he did during the French Revolution and he replied--"I survived!" For some of us existing under Public Employees Acts where the strike or the sanction is the ultimate faculty weapon--survival itself may depend on effectively understanding the faculty.

I have spent some time exploring what the teachers may not be, and I have put forth the position that the teaching staff should be a faculty. Now I am obligated by my own didactic approach to analyze fully what is implied by that term "faculty."

Grammatically, the faculty is collective, and it would be accurate to say that they are individuals sharing some broad general values and attached to an institution we call a community college. In Michigan the law goes further by deciding which of the faculty may constitute the bargaining unit. However, the more one disects the anatomy of the faculty it is apparent that the collective whole must not be mistaken for a consensus. Members of the faculty may all, more than likely, be divided on key issues, as well as precisely where their role in higher education is to be. It is upon this point that any attempt at prescriptive solutions to <u>faculty</u> problems would break down. I have not been asked by our conference leaders, and thankfully so, to provide remedies for specific faculty problems, but I would like to identify what I think are some major segments within the faculty that may exist on any campus in any faculty.

By and large, administrative difficulties with the faculty are not because they are attempting to run the institution, but rather like our general voting public, they are apathetic. They tend to react to situations, and I might parenthetically add, usually at the worst possible time and place for their own political advantage.

A taxonomic description of the faculty, I realize, is subject to the methodological limitation of neatly segregating the faculty in rigid categories when, in fact, humans seldom conform to such patterns. Therefore, let us think of faculty members as existing within a series of concentric circles over-lapping and shifting, depending on particular issues.

At the core of faculty is what is popularly called today the "militants" or "activists." This faculty member has a strong identification of his role as winning or gaining faculty rights whatever is implied by this term. Characteristic of the activist is a suspicion of the administrator and the board of control because they have considerable influence in the decision-making process and have the tools to effectively translate their wants into the policy of the institution. The militant faculty member believes, rightfully or wrongly, that the faculty is far better equipped by role and training to determine policies for the institution. The rationale for this premise is that the faculty is far less susceptible to external corruptive influence than the board or its administration,

and that they are as teachers far closer to the true purpose for which the institution exists that is teaching the student.

A position paper drafted by the Michigan Federation of Teachers Committee on Higher Education defined the "state of the profession" in the following way:

> "Teachers in our colleges and universities can hardly be called a true profession able to attract and hold the finest and most sensitive minds to college teaching; to sustain that quality of education reflected in close ties between teacher and student; to have a genuine voice in the formulation of policy affecting the conduct of the profession; to control the conditions of teaching and learning for maximum effectiveness and create growth.
>
> "Our colleges and universities are dominated by the corporate structure so typical of American business. The boards of trustees (like the board of directors), the college presidents and deans (like the managers) determine, in the last analysis, the mode and degree of compensation, the nature of facilities, the number of students admitted, the size of classes, and the extent of the professional and ancillary staff."

The militant faculty member views his relationship with the administration and the board as that of an adversary. Implied in the term is that each adversary to a question deals from a position of power on an equal footing. Militants disagree as to whether the adversary role can best be served in a legislative setting such as a faculty senate or through a judicial setting--collective bargaining.

Another grouping of the faculty consists of those who are less interested in actual governance over the institutions affairs but are concerned with such an issue as academic freedom. This scope of academic freedom would include freedom in the classroom, speaker's policy, college newspaper, students' rights, and the right for faculty to take an active political role in the community.

Generally, this faculty member would take an absolutist position on freedom and view with suspicion any attempt by the administration or board to limit freedoms. The faculty absolutist is concerned with the procedures by which such policies are made and how they are implemented. They believe that it is the role of the administrator to defend these policies at any cost--at any risk to his professional security. This group views the college as a sanctum for truth against the frailties of vested community pressures.

A third element of the faculty are those who believe that a strong faculty organization is sufficient to work out problems of mutual concern between the faculty, administration, and the board. They would welcome administrative participation in faculty government and would argue that there are certain matters which the faculty is in a far better position to take leadership while in other areas they would concede that the administration and/or the board are better equipped by role or responsibility to initiate policy. This faculty member potentially could join the ranks of the militants if the administration and board were to attempt to monopolize the decision-making function for the institution or to deal with the faculty in a perfidious way.

I hope you are not dazed by the concentric circles I have already presented. The fourth group of the faculty consists of those who view the administration in the military context of the officers and themselves as enlisted men, or in the business hierarchy of the "bosses" and the "employees." This faculty member may object, grumble or even protest--but only within the confines of his office or among trusted friends. This person rejects personally taking any initiative which might be viewed by the "higher-ups" as intruding upon their prerogatives. In fact, in many instances for reasons that are at times baffling, this faculty member will even check with the dean to see if it is acceptable that he participate on certain committees or in faculty groups. Often this faculty member is alien to the ethos of what we might call the college or university syndrome of faculty participation in its governance.

The last circle I will draw is one of the most perplexing to any administrator. It is that formed by the completely apathetic faculty members. On some campuses one would find the majority of the faculty in this grouping. This is the person who teaches his classes, meets his offices hours, and then evaporates. It is the faceless faculty member who comes and goes but never develops any commitment to the institution nor does he make any effort to work toward the solution of the institution's problems. What more can be said about him!

I suspect that each of you is fitting a number of your faculty into the schematic that I have outlined and are also stretching some of the lines of the circles to encompass faculty that don't quite fit neatly into my categories. I hope that I am stimulating you to think in some analytical way about your faculty. Thus far you have patiently listened to my description of the faculty as functionary, facility, or faculty and to a type-casting of faculty that might exist on your campus. There are at least two other dimensions of the question of faculty that should be considered: The role of faculty in the governance of the community college and the particular form that such governance might take; and what we as administrators can do to provide a healthy climate in the community college so that the philosophy and purposes of the institution may be realized.

It is axiomatic in my thinking, as evidenced by my earlier remarks, that I believe the faculty should have a maximum amount of freedom in order to realize the primary goal of the community college which is effective teaching. Tangential to this position is the belief that the faculty should play a key role in the determination of educational policy. Included in my definition of educational policy would be instruction in the classroom, grading, admissions, probation, and withdrawal policies affecting students, curriculum planning and course approvals. The faculty should also participate in the selection and evaluation of new instructors and administrators as well as helping to arrive at acceptable salaries and working conditions.

The budgetary process should begin at the department level with active faculty involvement. Faculty involvement in planning the allocation of economic resources may have the following advantages: 1) Utilizing the individual talents of faculty related to the needs of the teaching area where they would be most knowledgeable; 2) Introducing faculty to the complexities of judicially spreading limited funds and opening up another meaningful avenue of effective communication between the administration and faculty and lastly, helping to debunk the popular faculty myth that there are some funds not accountable at the fingertips of the president for his pet projects.

Time does not permit any lengthy discussion of the implications of the faculty role in any of these particular areas and again, hopefully before the conclusion of the conference, we may have time to explore them.

You may note that neither the subject of this conference nor my remarks have touched on the role of students in the governance of the community college. I hope that some consideration wi'l be given to this complex question before we adjourn.

Thus, in a general way, I have singled out areas of faculty concern and hopefully their involvement, but as of yet there has been no consideration of the particular vehicle through which the voice of the faculty should be channeled.

Frankly, I am not overly concerned with faculty governmental forms or structures. To a great extent, the particular form that a faculty government will take depends on a number of localized conditions peculiar to that institution. There are, however, certain conditions which I believe must exist in the formulation and operation of any faculty government if it is to be effective.

First, it must be representative of the faculty and of the administration if that be its style. Again, whether the council or senate represents departments or other subdivisions of the college is immaterial at this point, but some effective method of adequately representing large areas of the faculty has to be determined without depriving the smaller subdivisions of the college of an effective voice in policy-making.

Secondly, there has to be effective communication between the faculty government and the appropriate administrative and/or board members.

Thirdly, faculty government must have the power to rule in those areas which are legitimately within its power. It is the role of the administration to enforce, along with the faculty, those policies passed by the faculty senate. A faculty government soon loses the confidence of the faculty when it is viewed as a debating society or exists at the whim of the administration and board of control. The faculty is sufficiently perceptive to understand when a faculty structure has all of the attributes of a democratic body except the reason for its existence--that of governing.

What I have just described is a legislative approach to the faculty role in the governing of the community college. The emphasis here has been on the role of the faculty in the governance of the community college. Implied is the role of the administration, board of control, and the students in the ruling of the institution.

Considerable effort has been expended by scholars, and administration and faculty practitioners in attempting to neatly spell out the relative powers of each interest group in the governance of the college and university.

The problem is as old as formal education itself. We all remember that Socrates had his difficulties with the Athenian Board of Trustees and they with him.

Frankly, I believe a definitive delineation of power is impossible.

Impossible for these reasons: 1) Colleges are not like industrial organizations where people are organized around the task of production. 2) There is struggle within any college or university between the demands for uniformity and the appeal of a certain intellectual anarchy, and 3) The refusal of faculty administration, board or students to concede too great of a role to one another in

the governance of the college. The logical consequence of these relationships is conflict among and between groups concerned with the governance of the community college.

However, conflict in itself is not unhealthy or destructive...it may, if the climate of the institution is healthy, result in constructive resolution of problems through the technique of compromise and accommodation. I also submit that if this institutional health I describe exists, there are more areas of fundamental agreement on basic issues that exist than differences that will contribute to the resolution of conflicts.

I believe this to be true of a legislative approach to the solution of institutional problems but there is, in at least a few states, another approach. It is called collective bargaining which I submit is a judicial approach for conflict resolution. A discussion of faculty government would be incomplete without some discussion of collective bargaining and the resultant Master Contract. Under collective bargaining a single bargaining agent is designated by a majority vote of the faculty and certified by a state authority. It is the bargaining agent alone that speaks for the faculty.

Employee and employer, as the relationship can more accurately be described, are adversaries, who by role negotiate from a basis of power. Conclusion of this process is a Master Contract that may or may not provide for compulsory arbitrating according to state law. Several of those faculty who favor this approach would contend that the administration's relationship to the faculty should be similar to that of hospital administrators to doctors. In other words, the basic decision-making authority of the institution should rest with the collective bargaining unit and the administration's task should be one of administering--or as one member of our faculty (I might add a former colleague of mine in the Michigan Federation of Teachers) told me that he will be happy when he sees us (administrators) just shuffling papers all day. If I may state it more precisely, the attempt is to make all issues negotiable that affect the college. Under the provisions of the law the administration is limited in its dealing with the faculty. Generally, Master Contracts provide a grievance procedure for faculty who contend that their rights have been violated under the contract. The ultimate faculty weapon in such a relationship is the strike, whether granted under the law or not. Unfortunately, there may be circumstances, in hopefully few if any community colleges, where the faculty believes that its interests can only be protected through the provisions of a contract enforceable by law.

But the shift from an internally operated faculty legislative body to that of a judicially centered body has implications that a few of us are just beginning to understand. Let me elaborate. One change has been that the faculty senate, where it existed in an institution before a Master Contract, has been undermined. The administration and faculty are confused as to its proper role--if it has one. In many instances the negotiations for the board and faculty are conducted by lawyers who in most cases understand little about the operations of colleges and universities. The result of their ignorance is often found in provisions of the Contract which are written in a way that is unintelligible to the laymen and contributes to the confusion and suspicion that exists between the administration and the faculty. Further, and probably the most alarming, is that the administration and the faculty are dependent on lawyers for the interpretation of the contract. The question of where interpretation ends and determination of policy begins is problematic at best. It is evident where national teacher organizations are involved the terms of the settlement must be approved by state and national offices of those organizations. The relationship between

the administration and the faculty by virtue of the grievance procedure becomes that of employer and employee. How does the administration view the faculty, as a member of a profession or an adversary--employee? How does the faculty view the administrator--as an aid in facilitating the educational process, or as an employer and all the term implies?

The worst aspect of the Master Contract is that it points up in a formal legalized manner the negative relationships that may exist between faculty-administration and board. What is evident in dealing with faculty in this new relationship is that they often are indignant and hurt when the administration deals with them in the context of the Master Contract.

My friend, Ray Howe, executive dean of Henry Ford Community College, a former vice-president of the American Federation of Teachers, stated it this way at a recent state meeting of the A.A.U.P.:

> "I believe there's a very significant change in the relationship of administration and faculty that I can point to specifically. As a former faculty activist, I defended the importance of faculty participation in the selection of administrators. As a union officer, I would concede that the unions have no business determining the composition of management. Now you face a dilemma. You can be a faculty and you can claim all of the prerogatives of faculty, and I will support you. You can be a union and claim all the prerogatives of unionism, and I'll support you, but I'll be damned if I'll support anybody when they want the best of both worlds. Then it's a dogfight, and the devil can take the hindmost."

The question may be asked, "Is collective bargaining inevitable throughout the country?" I don't know. But it is interesting that in some colleges in Michigan where it has occurred there have been the best working conditions as well as strong faculty governments. I cannot help but remember the historian, Crain Brintan's thesis that revolution doesn't occur among the abject poor but among those who are sufficiently aware there is something better. Therefore, it may be, and I don't feel comfortable with the analogy, that for many faculty they are caught in the syndrome of rising expectations--the more self-government, the more that is demanded. My immediate comments, I am afraid, are not conducive to approaching the question of what is the administrator's role in assuring effective administration-faculty relations? Regardless of the turn of faculty politics there are certain actions which I believe that the administration is obligated to follow in its dealing with the faculty. Time obligates me to only outline them for you.

1) Carry out all agreements with the faculty which includes not short-circuiting the agreed upon procedures which have been established.

2) All the rules of the game should be spelled out in writing--all personnel policies and institutional regulations. Every faculty member should have a copy and they should be followed.

3) Comment has already been made on faculty involvement in the decision-making process.

4) If you are short on experience in the community college, hire a key administrator who has had years of experience--an activist if possible--and listen to him.

5) Communicate with the faculty. This doesn't mean tell them about some action after it has occurred. Let them be one of the first to know about decisions that affect them.

6) Make decisions and stand for something. The faculty wants a leader and hopefully it would be their president and deans. The Board of Control may make us administrators, but only the support of the faculty will make us educational leaders.

7) Read teacher organization journals, and, if possible, attend their meetings on a state or national level. Try to understand what they consider important and what national and state trends are regarding teacher organizations.

In concluding, I am reminded of a story told by President Logan Wilson who said:

> "Most administrators, to be sure, recognize that they earn their pay mainly in trying to solve problems stemming from and created by other persons. Some find this exciting, others overwhelming. Here I am reminded that not long ago I inquired of an acquaintance about a certain administrative officer in his relatively new post. 'Oh,' he said, 'haven't you heard? He got fed up with working on other people's problems and went back to teaching, where he could pick his own problems.' When I related this to another person who also knew the former administrator, he added, 'What he meant was that it is more fun just to be a problem'".

The best advice that I heard in dealing with faculty was from Dr. William Habber, Dean of Liberal Arts at the University of Michigan. Professor Habber is nationally recognized, as many of you know, in the field of labor relations. He said, "Love the faculty till it hurts. . . Love every one of those s.o.b's. So I close with a plea for love.....

REPORTS OF THE THREE GROUP SESSIONS
WEDNESDAY EVENING DECEMBER 6, 1967

GROUP I, Chairman Dr. John Riggs, Executive Dean

Observations of the national scene indicate a great deal of unrest and militancy, and perhaps to a lesser extent in Arizona. Perhaps the term unrest in reality represents an expression of frustration of many unmet human needs in the educational enterprise. Perhaps this unrest and militancy is long overdue as a result of poor administrative relationships. Historically, administrators have tended to be either too autocratic, too paternalistic, or both. In general, faculties have not been involved in those policies which directly affect their working conditions.

It appears that we may be heading for collective bargaining which would lead to master contracts. While such master contracts may yield material gains for the teachers it is the general consensus of this group that the teaching profession could never achieve full professional maturity under such arrangements. Teachers might gain, but the educational programs would lose.

Some feel that collective bargaining is inevitable, but there may be some alternatives. These alternatives hinge on the involvement of the faculty in an orderly procedure and with full confidence in arriving at policy recommendations. It is not simply a matter of an either-or situation, but a process of using the collective intelligence of both groups after consideration of all available facts.

Certain organizational structures will facilitate such involvement:

1. Faculty senates
2. College-wide committees
    a. Registration committees
    b. Curriculum committees, and the like
3. Teacher benefit committees
    a. Salary
    b. Faculty loads, and the like

Other suggestions for involving faculty and adding to their status would be found in making presentations to the governing board.

While all faculty members are deeply concerned with salary problems they may be equally, if not more so, concerned about those processes that determine their participation in policy recommendations for all working conditions. The teacher is a human being and should be given respect to help him preserve his dignity as a human being.

GROUP II, Chairman Dean A. Curtis, President

Numerous factors were mentioned and discussed as possible causes of faculty unrest. Among these were salaries, large numbers of new faculty members, snowballing effect of communications regarding unrest in other areas, status insecurity, and the possibility that faculty view points are evolving more rapidly than those of administrations.

The question was raised as to what possibilities a faculty member has to gain recognition. One means was noted with approval. This was that each faculty member should be rendered sincere respect for his contributions.

Principles which guide the respective roles of faculty and administration in academic governance should be determined by the effect they have on instruction and the benefits to students. Democratic processes should be followed in determining these roles and, above all, efforts should be expanded in increasing the degree of mutual respect between the two groups. The particular roles to be played by faculty and administration met with little uniformity of opinion. Views on faculty role ranged from that of adviser and originator of ideas to that of co-determiner of policies. Similarly, the administration's role was viewed on a continuum from decision-maker to servant.

It was felt that the AAHE classifications of influence on decision-making was too limited. Institutions chose not to classify themselves on the given scale and expressed the view that faculties might have quite a different classification than that given by administration. There was general agreement that the classification would vary with a particular issue and circumstance.

There was rejection of the concept that authority could be shared equally between faculty and administration on all issues. The principle of cooperative efforts was deemed more appropriate.

A structure of representative participation, in keeping with our national tradition, was considered preferable for faculty participation. This representative democratic structure, based on mutual respect and providing for maximum faculty expression, should be suited to the size of the institution.

Group II indicated an interest in involving faculty and administration in the organizing of an Arizona Junior College Association which, at its outset, would not be affiliated with nor require membership in any other organization. Such an organization might assist faculty-administration cooperation and also help faculty members to attain the identity referred to by Dr. Jacobs.

GROUP III, Chairman A. W. Flowers, Vice President for Business Services

WE BELIEVE

1. That governance of junior colleges has become much more complex in nature and shall demand involvement of:

   a. Governing Board
   b. Administration
   c. Faculty
   d. Students

2. That successful governance must include a new relationship between faculty and administration including:

   a. Cooperation
   b. Mutual Respect
   c. Shared "authority" and "shared responsibility"

3. That power is now a "tool" of faculty and heretofore has been a tool common only to Board and Administration.

4. That effective understanding of faculty and faculty philosophy shall lead to effective solutions whether through faculty senate, negotiation, or some vehicle less militant in nature.

5. That roles have been redefined for administration, and faculty and that, as administrators, we must clearly understand these roles - along with the responsibilities intricately involved with said roles.

6. That training must be an on-going obligation for the administrator if he is to survive - said training varying from knowledge of such literature as issued by AFT, AEA, NEA, AAUP, etc. to specific management training in order to equip him to bargain in a "tough" across-the-table situation, where necessary.

Specific items involved are:

a. Thorough knowledge of how the faculty views administration and board- and their roles and responsibilities.

b. Use of a POSITIVE attitude rather than the deductive or negative approach to the governance problems.

c. Proper mental attitude is a must for administrators.

d. Trust and respect for the faculty as a total group, though we know each group shall probably involve deviants.

e. Involvement at all phases tends to evolve into acceptable decisions.

WE RECOMMEND

1. That a "follow-up" meeting be held involving Board members and Administrators - informative and instructive in nature.

and

2. That eventual meetings be held jointly with faculty involvement.

SUMMARY REPORT

by
John T. Condon
Executive Director
Arizona State Junior College Board

INTRODUCTION

Problems of governance, especially the respective roles of teaching faculty and administration, are among the most pressing facing higher education today. The junior-community colleges are less bound by history and tradition and less fixed in organization than their colleagues, thus presently are in a most advantageous position to approach such problems in an imaginative and flexible manner. If the issues are faced intelligently and with foresight, such institutions may avoid some of the major pitfalls which have characterized personnel relationships in many of the four-year institutions in recent years.

To provide opportunity to explore this fundamental issue, the Arizona State Junior College Board and the Center for the Study of Higher Education, College of Education, Arizona State University, cooperated in the sponsorship of a two-day invitational conference for top administrative officers of the Arizona Junior Colleges.

Two experienced and highly regarded junior college administrators addressed the group and remained throughout the two days as consultants and resource personnel. After the two presentations during the first conference session, one emphasizing the role of the faculty and the other the role of administration in governance, the remainder of the conference was concerned with discussion of the general problem in an effort to arrive at tentative conclusions and recommendations. It is expected that this exploratory conference will be followed with similar meetings involving teaching faculty as well as administrators.

CONFERENCE SUMMARY

The conferees had an opportunity to become acquainted with an understanding of the trend toward faculty and student concerns about governance within colleges and universities. This conference was designed to learn ways of improving the current practices of involvement in Arizona community colleges of faculty and students in the planning and development of the procedures to be practiced.

It is very complex to discuss in any finality the governance of community colleges due to their national and statewide newness. They are still evolving institutions. They have attracted people from all walks of educational and experiential backgrounds. With each has come his own approaches to organizing and administering community colleges.

One of our consultants, Dr. Carl Jacobs, Vice President, Flint Michigan Community College, spoke on the role of the faculty in governance of junior-community colleges. His presentation was the nucleus for the 3 group work sessions that were held during the evening, following the major presentation. The group reports will be discussed later in the summary.

Our other consultant, Dr. Joseph Cosand, President, Junior College District of St. Louis, spoke on the role of the administrator in governance of the junior-community college. He discussed the following points: a. the role of the board to the president; b. the president's relationship to the board; c. the board's

relationship to the administrative staff; d. the administrative role in governance of community colleges--the main point under this discussion was that administrators are to "work for a balanced effort;" e. the president's relationship to the public; and f. the role of the legal advisory to the president and the board.

As I had just returned from the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education Conference in Denver, where the topic of major concern was the role of the state governing bodies and local colleges and universities, I interjected that the trend is toward more state involvement in the administration and control of individual colleges and universities within the state boundaries. The community college portion of the Denver conference brought many concerns to the forefront. (see summary of the Denver Conference). Because of this trend for state bodies to be part of the governance of colleges and universities, I felt that they are an important segment in any discussion concerning the governance of community colleges, as well as universities.

I have taken excerpts from the notes of each of the Work Groups mentioned above. The observations are as follows:

1. Principles which guide the respective roles of faculty and administration in academic governance should be determined by the effect they have on instruction and the benefits to students. Democratic processes should be followed in determining these roles and above all, effort should be expanded in increasing the degree of mutual respect between the two groups.

2. A structure of representative participation in keeping with our national tradition was considered preferable for faculty participation. This respective, democratic structure, based on mutual respect and providing for maximum faculty expression should be suited to the size of the institution.

3. Observations of the national scene indicate a great deal of unrest and militancy but to a lesser extent in Arizona. Perhaps the term <u>unrest</u> in reality represents an expression of frustration of many unmet human needs in the educational enterprise.

4. In general, faculties have not been involved in those positions which directly effect their working conditions.

5. Some conferees felt that collective bargaining is inevitable but others felt that there were some other alternatives. These alternatives hinge on the involvement of the faculty in an orderly procedure and with full confidence in arriving at policy recommendations. It is simply not a matter of an either/or situation but a process of using collective intelligence of both groups after consideration of all available facts.

6. The governance of junior colleges has become much more complex in nature and shall demand involvement of: a. the governing board; b. the administration; c. the faculty; and d. the students.

7. The successful governance must include a new relationship between faculty and administration including: a. cooperation; b. mutual respect; c. shared "authority"; and d. "shared responsibility".

8. Power is now a "tool" of faculty when heretofore it has been a tool common only to the board and administration.

9. The effective understanding of faculty and faculty philosophy shall lead to effective solutions, whether through faculty senate, negotiation, or some vehicle less militant in nature.

10. The roles have been redefined for administration and faculty and that as administrators we must clearly understand these roles along with the responsibilities intricately involved with the said roles.

Following the summaries of the group reports, the last session of the conference was open to further discussion. It was interesting to note that rather than directing questions towards the responses or observations made by the three groups, the conferees as a whole resolved themselves into a deep and penetrating discussion of the role of the student in college governance. The apparent result of this discussion was that in addition to faculty, administration and board, there should be some serious consideration of the role of the student in the overall picture of governance of community colleges. Their participation at the moment varies among the colleges within the state. It appears that considerable involvement by students was desirable and was being implemented at various rates within the respective colleges.

I would like to extend, through this communique to you, my heartiest congratulations to Dr. Harry Newburn, Director of the Center for the Study of Higher Education at A.S.U. for the fine job that he did in coordinating the efforts of the Planning Committee and the administrative tasks related to the conference.

Those with whom I have had an opportunity to see following the conference all indicated they considered this one of the most worthwhile conferences that they have attended for sometime. I also will take this opportunity to congratulate the Arizona State Board of Directors for Junior Colleges on their foresight and willingness to co-sponsor with the Arizona State University this fine conference. It became apparent that follow-up conferences are desirable and with the efforts of Harry Newburn, the Presidents of the colleges and myself these will be forthcoming.

SUGGESTED QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION GROUPS

(Not designed to be all-inclusive)

1. What factors have given rise to current faculty unrest, especially as it applies to governance?

2. Where does the legal responsibility for governance of Arizona Junior-Community Colleges rest?

3. What principles should dictate the respective roles of faculty and administration in academic governance?

4. What are the <u>particular</u> roles of faculty and administration in the governance of a junior-community college?

5. The AAHE Task Force recognized a continuum in the distribution of influence on decision-making consisting of five zones: (1) administrative dominance, (2) administrative primacy, (3) shared authority, (4) faculty primacy, and (5) faculty dominance.

   a. Does this classification make sense?
   b. Where do you believe the Arizona Junior Colleges would classify on such a continuum?
   c. Where do you believe they should classify?

6. Does endorsement of the shared-authority concept mean that authority must be shared equally between administration and faculty on all issues? If not, what does it mean to you?

7. What organizational structures have been or can be made to implement faculty participation in governance?

8. What are the characteristics of an effective organizational structure for faculty participation in governance?

9. What suggestions do you have for the development of effective internal organizations as a means of encouraging and guiding faculty participation in the governance of Arizona Junior-Community Colleges?

11/30/67

JUNIOR COLLEGE ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE

Dr. Joseph Cosand, President

It's a pleasure to be here from St. Louis. As I listened to Dr. Jacobs talk about faculty members and types of faculty: Is it a function or is it a function area, a facility or a faculty? I couldn't help think of the Junior College District of St. Louis, where five years ago we had no students, a total payroll of ten. Today we have over 10,000 students and a payroll of over 700. Half of our faculty members, I would like to call them faculty have been with us one year or less. The problems that this creates are legion. In fact it is almost unbelievable. I was talking to Samuel Gould, President of the State of New York, as you know, and that includes some 65 institutions and he said, "the biggest problem that he saw in governance in faculty administration relationships was the unbelievable growth of some institutions and the problem of absorbing students and absorbing new faculty members because of the fact that you had your strata within the faculty and your new faculty were left out." He felt that maybe this was one of the biggest problems and Dr. Jacobs maybe you might want to talk about that business later on, that is the absorbtion in a hurry of a high percentage of a faculty and new administration staff.

This morning Addison Hickman's name was mentioned with respect to the study he had made along with some five others. I know Addison Hickman very well. He is a close friend of mine. He teaches at SIU, Southern Illinois University, and he is deeply concerned about many of the things Dr. Jacobs spoke about. He makes a tremendous plea, as President Durham said, for shared responsibility and he feels that if this shared responsibility is not present you are going to have social revolution instead of social evolution. I think maybe we might remember that old philosophical term, that if you don't have continuous social evolution you certainly are going to have periodic social revolution. I think much of the problem we face today is in this area.

Another digression with respect to the Carnegie Commission. This Carnegie Commission was appointed a study for three to five years and originally stated the purpose as the financing and organizational structure of higher education. When this Committee of 15 met for the first time they talked in terms of financing and structure. There was a tremendous urgency on the part of all to work in the area of financial needs but all of a sudden we realized as a group that it is rather ridiculous to study finance before you know what you are studying finance for. So the whole study has been reversed and added to and now we are to study the function, the structure and the financing of higher education throughout the United States in public and private education, if you will, for more than 2,000 educational institutions. The study will take from three to five years and is financed a million dollars a year by the Carnegie Corporation. The Committee is chaired by Clark Kerr and as we have met now three times I say this sincerely be the Committee member a laymen or be he an educator he is overwhelmed by the complexity of the problems facing higher education in the years to come. One thing alone: six million students today, ten million by 1975.

The furling of costs where the average growth per year is about 4%, 5% compounded, the cost 7 1/2% compounded, you but those two together in colleges which now have deficits will see those deficits triple by 1975. So the questions arising is: What is the function of each institution by type if you will; what is the function of the community college, what is the function of the state college, of the state university, the private liberal arts college, the great private universities? Whether a person be president of Harvard, president of the University of Illinois, or president of the Junior College District in St. Louis, there is complete agreement that we cannot go on down different paths without understanding one another, without cooperating with one another without coordinating our efforts. There is no longer really the opportunity to have the priviledge of splendid isolationism which we have had certainly in the private sector for many, many years.

Another digression but closely related to governance. We can't very well govern unless we know what we are governing. In Missouri, for example, there is all of a sudden an agreement that we have a problem in higher education. All of a sudden there is an agreement between private institutions and public institutions that they cannot go their own separate ways. This is the first time since I have been in Missouri in five years that there has been any attempt made to cooperate to reach agreement. I suppose this is due to finance for after all when the dollar gets short people all of a sudden begin to realize that something has to happen. Thus; the special committee of the Missiori Association of Colleges and Universities met Monday this week in St. louis, including two presidents of private institutions both prestigious, two presidents of public institutions, (one of the state university and one of the junior college district) to see if we could set in motion methods of cooperation, methods of sharing responsibilities, definitions of function so that we don't duplicate unnecessarily. Maybe complete and absolute new approaches are essential to our future. Maybe higher education in the future will only be that beyond the bachelors degree. Maybe this will be the future higher education. This was verbalized by one of the university presidents. Maybe undergraduate education will be called intermediate education. Such meetings reveal a very sincere concern for what faces not only the community colleges but private universities, state colleges, state universities, and small liberal art colleges as well. They always end up with the understanding that never in the history of America has higher education been supported as well, but at the same time perhaps never have we failed in higher education to get our story across to the public as badly as we have failed now but the public does not understand the problems facing higher education. The President of St. Louis University, Paul Reinert is hep on this subject and he talks over and over again about the problem that we as higher education people face in telling the public: "sure you supported us, sure the state contributions have increased markedly in Missouri (102% in the last five years for higher education) but it's not enough and you aren't aware of the problems that are facing the liberal arts colleges where maybe because they refused to change their methods of operation."

The state scholarship bill in Illinois has affected the number of Illinois students who are coming to private colleges in Missouri and thus two private college presidents yester day said, "Our enrollments are down because of the state scholarship bills in states such as Illinois, and California." These are things we have to look at and what I am trying to do I guess is to say, let's look at the broad picture in governance for

all of higher education. Lets look at the fact that you people from Arizona State University or other Arizona universities are just as involved as we are in this overall governance of higher education. So in my major presentation I want to talk in terms of the role of the administration in the governance of the college in the broad sense. First we'll look at the president's relationship to the board. Which is an extremely important part of governance. What is his relationship? The first part is professional, it's one of education and counseling, one of getting a board to understand the educational program of that institution, getting a board to understand the problems facing the teaching of any class whether it be technical or academic you name it. Getting the board to be instructionally oriented, not brick and mortar oriented, instructionally oriented that is their job and they were elected to do this. I am amazed as I go across the country as a member of an accreditation team or as a consultant to find that the boards almost without exception have no concept of the educational program of that institution that they are supposed to be operating. They seem to think their job is to pass on the financial requests that come in and this is a tragedy because they are the representatives of the people.

The second point in working with the board is to work with the board as a whole. I hear presidents quite often say, "Well you know before the board meeting occurs I've checked each of the board members and explain to him how he should vote." When you do this you don't have a board of trustees but rather you have individuals and they don't work as a board. The president of the district must work with the whole board openly at all times and not indivudually to try to get a board member to vote the way he wants that board member to vote. I think this latter is unprofessional.

The third point is openess and honesty. We find in those presidential relationships which are good there is a give and take, there is mutual respect, there is an openess, there is an on the table operation, neither the Board nor the president suspects the other. If you have suspicion between a board and a president that suspicion is going to go through your whole educational institution and it's going to cause problems with respect to the administrative relationships with faculty.

The fourth point. This point was voiced by a board member from Washington State University at the last meeting of the American Council on Education in Washington. She said, "Will you as a president's please keep us as board members informed?" How do you keep a board informed? You keep a board informed by preparing as agenda for each meeting and sending out say 72 hours ahead of time so they can think about it. You send along with that agenda a letter of transmittal, you send along materials which explain your letter of transmittal and which explain your agenda so that when the board comes to meet they are not coming there simply to eat, sleep, burp and then go home. I had this type of action described to me about a board of education just two weeks ago where one of the administrators said that's all they do. They come, they eat, they burp and they go home. Now this is the president's fault, this isn't the boards fault. So you keep the board informed by letter of transmittal, by memoranda, telephone messages when there is something coming up that the board as a whole needs to know.

Supposing some kind of a crisis is approaching. The president should let the board know before it hits and explain to them what the problem is before they read about it or hear about it from a friend. Involvement of the staff at all of the board meetings is a further desirable move. Again I will make a plea for this. You have a faculty as Dr. Jacobs mentioned and it should be involved in the board meetings and should be present and there should at times be presentations made by faculty members. Again, I'm surprised when I hear president's say, "Well you really don't want a faculty member at the board meeting do you. Of course, we will tolerate them and let them sit there if they want to. "But isn't it far better to have a group of teachers who have prepared some new program in English instruction or maybe in the sciences, or the social sciences, or in the teaching of art make a presentation to the board so the board can go throughout the area and say we know what this instructional program is?

The last point of this business of keeping the board informed is that the board itself understand the need for sufficient board meetings. I find that an alive educational program supported by the total staff of the board is difficult to develop if the board meets once a month and then maybe only passes on formal business. I think the number of meetings will vary somewhat according to the development of the district whether it's new or whether it's stabilized. But even if the college has plateaued an enrollment and generally stabilized where a board loses interest you are going to find a regression.

The last point on this business the president's relationship with the board is the staff relationship with the board. What relationship do the other administrators have with the board? Do you as a president cut them off and say you are to be seen and not heard and not to be seen to often? All of our key administrators in St. Louis are al all board meetings. When anything comes up pertaining to one of our campuses or to business or to purchasing or to the building program itself it is referred to that staff member who is working in that area and he speaks to the board so that the board knows him just like it does the faculty when you have faculty presentations. At the same time you can't have all of these staff people calling board members individually thus there has to be an understanding between the president, the staff and the board as to what the climate for such participation must be. It's a climate of mutual respect among the administrators and the faculty members where each may visit and speak with the board members professionally but not try to pressure the board unprofessionally. This is a narrow fence that you walk but I think it's an extremely important fence to walk. I think it tends to eliminate many of the things that might encourage other problems to develop.

The second major point is the Board of Trustees. The first point was the president's relationship with the board, this second relates to the board of trustees as a part of campus governance. To establish the philosophy and objectives of the college as elected representatives of the people and to establish the policies by which the board will operate is their major function. Again I was a member of an accreditation team recently at a college where they had no board policies, where they had no board procedures, where they had nothing in writing at all. One of the basic tasks is to reach an agreement with the president on his relationships with the board. Ideally the board should set policies based upon recommendations from a district council made up of both administration and faculty so that recommendations for policy arise in this way and the board then sets the policy while the total staff or faculty and administration recommend policy. The president

then will administer the district within this policy where recommendations for the administrative procedure come from the administrative council to the board.

I think that faculty and administration have a right to recommend policy as a joint body. I think the administrators who are administering the institution with assistance of a president should recommend the administrative procedures which are established under which the president operates. It should be agreed that at no time will board members use pressure individually or collectively with respect to the employment or termination of a staff member or with respect to the approval or disapproval of a member for personal reasons. This is the only ultimatum that I ever gave within our district when I said that the first time a board member or members exert pressure of this kind to a point where it becomes a fact, my resignation is immediately forthcoming. The board has no right to do this. In the city of St. Louis the board operated this way for years and years and finally there was a revolution and the board was thrown out.

Further, it should be agreed that all board action will be taken at open meetings at which all interested citizens and the press will be welcome. No board action should be taken unless anyone who wants to be at that board meeting can be there and see what the action is.

The next point. Be above public or vested interest pressures. The total board serves all of the people all of the time there is never any justification for believing a board member represents any group be it religious, racial or economic. Let me tell you a story that occurred during my first year in St. Louis. There was a member of our board who was a negro and one evening he got very emotional and he sat there at the board meeting and he pounded the table and he said, "I represent the negroes of this district." He hardly got those words out of his mouth before a member of our board who is a lawyer, President of the Bar Association, a very devout catholic, a very strong supporter of the St. Louis University said, "Don't you ever let me hear you say that again, you do not represent the negroes of this district you represent every single citizen of this district because you are a member of the board you have no right to say that." The chap hardly got that out before another member of our board who was a millionaire druggist, very active in the Jewish community came out even stronger. He said, "Mr. Robin, I don't want you to ever think that you as a negro are here to represent the negroes. I'm a Jew and if I thought that I were here just to represent the Jews I would resign." From that time we never have had a single thing come up where a single member of this board ever indicated that he or she was there to represent a group be it racial, religious or economic.

Split votes are healthy and no board should ever become a rubber stamp for the president of the district. This is a part of campus governance. If the administrator feels that he personally is hurt because the board has a split vote, God help him. If he thinks that he has to have a unanimous vote on everything that comes up then I would say he is a very weak and insecure administrator or president. Split votes are healthy. I would feel very badly if we didn't have at least one split vote at each board meeting and ordinarily we have more than one. I would also feel very bad if it were always the same split, four to two, five to one or something of this sort.

The board should be interested primarily in the educational program and in the curriculum offered for the students to be served. They must not permit the educational offerings for any reason to be limited to the needs of only a portion of the community. This emphasizes again that the board member does not represent a region, a religious group or a racial group. If he does the board will tend to start looking at the budget in terms of serving a particular vested interest pressure. This emphasizes a president's role in working with a board, the total administration's role working with the board. When tendencies to split or represent factious arise, and they are going to come up more and more in urban areas like St. Louis because the president must counteract such tendencies. If our board begin to show discrimination in its efforts in favor of the negroes or against the negroes then they no longer are serving the people of that district properly. This is a problem of governance and is just as important as any relationship the administration would have with any group. This problem of educating the board is part of the president's job, is part of all administrator's jobs, is part of the faculty's job.

Another point: boards too often concern themselves with only brick and mortar, with business and finance. Discuss the instructional program first at each board meeting - this must always be the chief concern. This is whey a board was elected - to develop an educational program.

The third major point. The president's relationship to administration. I think too often we forget this fact: we as presidents have a role to play with the other administrators and I would like to hit these points.

First: educative and counseling-educative and counseling in terms of a group and in terms of individuals. If you don't do this your administration isn't going to know what you as a president are thinking and you may find your administration going in different directions.

The second point: openness and honesty in all discussions both in individual and group. This demands mutual respect, but when you can get across the table and talk openly and above board, you then have a chance of solving some of the problems that face all of the administration.

Again a digression on a recent accreditation visit. The only person in this college who knew what the salaries were for anybody-teachers, administrators, you name it,-were the president and the business manager. Salaries, I found out, had been changed within the year as needed. This is not a fairytale, this happened about a month ago. There certainly is no openness and honesty in a situation like this and this is the type of think that causes the breakdown.

The third point -encourage ideas and creativity. We have a statement in our district which we try to live by and sometimes it causes alot of trouble. It is this: We would far rather have to dampen a fire or even put it out than have to start it. The persons involved with you in administration should feel that there is a climate where their ideas are going to be listened to.

This is part of campus governance. Some of the ideas are undoubtedly going to be haywire-all oysters don't have pearls,-but they might like to think they would like to grow one. Too often you will see this breakdown where here sits the president in his omniscient role and here are the rest of the administrators, yes sir! Delegate and expect action. I don't think it's any good just to say you delegate. If you do delegate then expect action. That is what the other person is there to do.

The fourth point, expect commitment to the philosophy in a multi-campus. This is a particularly difficult problem. Is there a commitment throughout the district? Chicago has eight junior colleges, Los Angeles has seven, Maricopa District has three, we have three, Oakland Community College has three, and so forth. Is there throughout the district a commitment to the philosophy and the objectives of the district or is there a movement toward complete fragmentation for the institutions?

Now I'm not talking about control from the central source. I am talking about belief. The same thing is true within any college itself and the ambivalence that you will see in many junior college faculties exists so often because of the fact that people don't really understand what this strange institution is. There are dilemmas here but there has to be a commitment on the part of the administration because if administration doesn't have a commitment, how on earth can they provide any leadership?

The next point, expect leadership because this is a prime function of administration. I think this expecting leadership goes throughout your staff and not just through administration because you will find some of the strongest leadership within your district will come from some of the most unexpected sources. Leadership can come from a classified person, it can come from any one of the faculty members. It can bubble up any where but certainly within administration itself you have to expect it. The others are frosting and you are glad but the administrator is there to give leadership and if he is not giving leadership, why is he there?

You heard the president of Arizona State University talk this morning about the role of the president. I think maybe the greatest thrill he gets by far is watching the personal growth of individuals. What a thrill it is to bring in a young administrator or somebody who is not so young and who has been kept down. We have some like that who were told. "Look you're an administrator but not a president so you be still." All of a sudden take the wraps off that person and what that person grow. I think it is the role of the president to do this and I think it's the role of other administrators to do this as well. Then it's the role of your division chairman, if you will, to do this with your faculty.

The fourth major point, the administration, its role in the governance of a college. I suppose that was really the key to what I was supposed to say. But these other things I wanted to state in broad outline.

I would say first of all and there may be real argument here. I would say, first of all that the role of the administration throughout be he a division chairman, a department chairman, or a dean, or vice president of business or a president that these people should work for balance within the educational programs so that when you go to your college campus or if you are a visitor to some other campus you will see a total educational program that is as nearly as in balance as possible. I mean by this the various aspects of the educational program, research for better teaching methods, conference travel, equipment, facilities, furnishings, salaries, fringe benefits. I'm talking balance.

There is a very, very large community college recently visited by an accreditation team. They have the highest salaries in the United States. They have the lowest student-teacher ratio any place I know in community colleges, and that's all they have. They have the poorest maintenance, the lousiest facilities no travel funds etc., etc. They have three things: salaries, low student-teacher ratio, low number of hours to teach but that's all they have. Their program was completely out of balance. I think an administrator's role working with faculty is to work for a balanced program in all areas not just in one or two or three. Know that you have enough money so that you can go places and not be provincial. I accused this staff of not knowing what was going on across the Hudson River. I don't think they did. They were completely provincial. This is part of governance.

The next point, is to provide leadership not control or convenience. I find one of the biggest problems in determining the administration's role in governance in St. Louis is the constant plea, and particularly from the business office, for convenience. Thats not their role, their role is to serve and convenience be damned. If it's just the convenience of the business office for some new procedure or for some new recommended board policy then I would say that they don't know that their function is to serve the instructional program. Unless your business office understands this you are going to have your educational program controlled out of your business office. So the role is to provide leadership and not control or convenience; - to encourage creativity not tradition. So administration's role in governance again throughout the staff is to encourage the creativity that is inherent in almost everybody. Going back to Sam Gould's comment about new faculty members and the fact that they tend to become activists. He said, "It's due to the fact, (and I agree with him) that the people who have gotten into control of the departments, of the divisions of the kitchen cabinets in these places simply say to these new people, 'Look we have always done it this way and we are not going to change.'" Let's get the ideas out, let's be creative and not live by tradition.

The next point, criticizeppositively to build not negatively to destroy. I suppose this is about as important as anything. Do we as administrators in governance criticize positively to build? This person needs criticism perhaps because he is young or because he is old and possibly been kept down for a long time. There needs to be a positive criticism here to build this person.

Yet I was in a district in Contra Costa many years ago where the whole philosophy was designed to destroy a person. I'm not kidding you. It was completely destructive. Now why does anybody in an administrative role do this? Again I would say it is due to the administrator's lack of confidence, his own insecurity.

Involve the faculty at all levels in both policy and procedural matters. Dr. Jacobs spoke about this and I would just like to re-emphasize it. If you are building buildings involve the faculty. Involve the faculty in budget preparation and for heavens sake when the budget is finally coming through and the faculty has been involved don't somewhere along the line in the business office or the president's office change it completely and never talk to the faculty about it. If I were a faculty member and I was involved in the process and such a change was made without communication the next time they asked me to be involved I know what I would tell them. You can't involve partially; you have to involve fully.

Eliminate weaknesses as soon as justifiable. Retention becomes a moral problem as much as does unjustifiable dismissal. I see too often in campus governance where the administrator loses the respect of the total staff because somebody has been kept on who everybody knows is not doing a job, but because there is a fear to ever create any kind of a problem he is kept on. This was true in California when they put through the instantenure law which some of you have heard about where a faculty member has a right to go to court even after he has been there only a year, if he's dismissed. When this law went into effect I said it would lead to mediocraty because weak administrators would not ever want to get into a bind and that's just what happened. So the retnetion of weaknesses is just as destructive as dismissal on an unjustified basis.

Establish written administrative procedures were justified. Too often administrators who don't have the strength or willingness to use common sense want a written policy, they want a procedure so they have a crutch so there no longer is need to think. They just use the crutch.

Constantly discuss and review philosophy and objectives. I find this one is as important as any. Does the administration with the faculty constantly discuss and evaluate the educational program? Has the administrator set a program and the student population changes but his program stays the same? John Lombardy, of Los Angeles, for example, found that the average test score of his entering students had dropped 20 points in four years but this hadn't been discovered until four years later. Now if this has happened and your faculty doesn't know about it you teaching a group you are not aware of. So there has to be this constant evaluation,- this is part of governance.

The faculty must be involved. Demand maturity in decision making rather than use of policy and procedural crutches. I hit that once before and I want to hit it again. We are finding in St. Louis that this is one of our problems. There is a constant increased pressure to get a new procedure, to get a new policy. Why? Because it's far easier than it is to make a decision based upon some careful thinking.

Another problem we are running into in governance. It is the provision of efficient services without the need for the creation of empires. I a multi-campus district, for example, you have alot of service agencies and we are finding that in the central office, there is a great desire to get one more person when you get one more person you find he needs a secretary and so you get little empires. We are finding out now that these empires are tending to segregate themselves on the campuses within the central office and I don't know what to do about it. You work at it. We are going to design a central office administration building. I have asked a chairman in that building to assume as his major responsibility the planning with the architect and with the central office personnel for a facility which retards any physical movement towards this empire building.

Can we build a building, for example, to provide for total governance and not fragmented governance? I don't know how many business administrators are here, but we tend to find that these empires are more important in the business areas than the other. Such as purchasing, accounting, data processing, lend themselves to such development. Have you ever come across that? I think this is part of campus governance because we hear about it from the faculty. What are the people in the central office really there for? Are they there to service, or are they there to run the college? These are interesting questions. Sometimes such personnel look at these empires as though they are there to run something the way they want to run it and the hell with the faculty members.

I think this is one of the problems administration has to look at. I have talked to our people over and over again on such topics. Why are are we here? We are here because the citizens voted the district into operation they provided the funds for this district to provide education for the students. Thus we as administrators, we as faculty members-us-we are here to serve you. There is no other reason. We can't have a we-they philosophy. We have talked about the power structure, the labor management structure-they-we-they. I think maybe as members of an administration we foster this we-they philosophy. I don't think it's conducive at all to the educational program we are suppose to build.

When B. La Mar Johnson was on our campus awhile back and was talking with one of the faculty membars and one of the administrators he was quite pleased at one of the comments that was made. As they turned to leave the administrator in parting turned to the faculty member and said, "Keep excited Gladys" and so Johnson has prepared a talk titled "Keep Excited Gladys". These three words speak great things. I think again it is the administrator's role in governance to provide a climate where the teacher can be excited and more importantly where she can keep excited.

The last few points I want to mention have to do with the administration's relationship with the public because this is part of governance. You will visit community after community and will find a negative kind of a climate set up between the college and the people of that community and you wonder what caused it. What developed this climate with the press? What developed this climate with T. V., radio, with labor, with management, with business. This is something that I think the president and his colleagues must work at continually. Not to give a snow job but to provide open honest information. In St. Louis, if we have something coming up that we think may be

a problem the television people, the radio people and the newspaper people know about it. They have never once broken faith with us. This is somethink that we cherish very much but we have never tried to hide anything from them. That is why I said earlier that all action in our shop takes place at an open board meeting. The faculty then knows what is going on, and the public knows what is going on as do business, industry and labor. We have attempted to involve business, industry and labor and we have 36 advisory committees from business, industry and labor working with us in our educational program. When you go anywhere as a member of the teaching staff, of the administrative staff, as a counselor or as a librarian you almost always in this large urban area of almost two million people will come across somebody who is working with you in the junior college district. This is part of governance because the public pays the taxes, and elects the board members. The public needs to understand this college. We do everything in our power to help the public to understand and this means the politicians as well as the businessmen, laborers, industrialists, professionals, media people. We don't shy away from a man because he is the mayor of St. Louis or because he is a congressmen or a senator. We give them all the information we can.

Finally, we have found a properly used legal counsel to be very helpful in campus governance. From our very first board meeting we have had a lawyer always present. He is present at each of our bid openings and he goes over the minutes of our board meeting with my secretary to be sure that they are legally correct. The public knows this and they respect us for always having the best legal advice obtainable. But more importantly, this lawyer has been with us for five years he knows our educational program to the point that he can talk as well as I can about it.

So I guess my plea really is that the role of the administration in the governance of the community college is a role which encourages growth of people. Continuous growth of the educational program requires leadership on the part of the administrator. Above all, the administrator must establish a climate of mutual respect among all of those who are working together: board, administration, teachers and classified staff.